

"1. Study Title : ""Journey into SPACE: Evidence-based Design of an App to Reduce Digital Addiction""

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific user feedback on app features and detailed download statistics by country.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to partnerships, such as with the Phone Life Balance CEO, and qualitative survey results on social norms feedback were more detailed in the REF submission(impact pathway).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version highlights policy impact implications through long-term strategies for DA regulation, which are not as explicitly covered in the AI version. Further, references to collaborative industry work on DA policy frameworks and intervention specifics were absent in the AI summary.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific design features such as the 'Focus Time' component and user feedback emphasizing perceived peer norms were detailed in REF but only summarized generally by the AI. Additional support from international reviews and tech outlets highlighted in REF was also absent.

---

"

"2. Study Title : Using Macroprudential Policies to Reduce the Risk of Financial Crises

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. The AI version omits certain details about how specific institutions like the OECD and Norges Bank adopted these tools in practice, which is covered in the REF version (e.g., influence on Finanstilsynet and the Ministry of Finance). 2. The practical use of macroprudential tools in global financial models (NiGEM) for evaluating systemic risks is mentioned in the REF version but less detailed in the AI report.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific use of the NiGEM model in predicting global economic trends and the precise influence on the Central Bank of Norway and the IMF's Financial Soundness Indicators.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed role of specific institutions (NIESR, Norges Bank, IMF) in applying models and tools; mention of concrete frameworks like the NiGEM model.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed use of tools like NiGEM in the economic forecasting models and specific role descriptions of organizations like Finanstilsynet in regulatory influence.

---

"

"3. Study Title : Utilising the human-canine relationship to support vulnerable people in the criminal justice system

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission specifically mentions that the initiative was adopted in 10 additional courts in England and led to changes in judicial practices in New South Wales, Australia. It also mentions the Victims' Commissioner highlighting this as a ""good practice"".

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included detailed references to national newsletters and specific court systems, such as the HM Courts and Tribunals Service and the Victims' Commissioner for England and Wales. These contextual elements and some quantitative data about the number of courts and police forces involved are not explicitly mentioned in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of international adoption by organizations in France and Australia, as well as the detailed role of Intermediaries for Justice in sharing and promoting the research.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original REF submission highlights specific endorsements by entities such as the Victims' Commissioner and international justice organizations (e.g., NSW Department of Justice). These endorsements underscore credibility and serve as a testament to the policy shift at various jurisdictional levels.

"  
"4. Study Title : Embedding responsible practices into business by taking inspiration from the Quakers

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version specifically mentioned collaboration with organizations such as The Quiet Company to interpret and integrate the UN SDGs, which was missing in the AI version. This was a critical part of embedding Quaker values into their business strategy.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder testimonies, particularly quotes from organizations like The Lang Cat Ltd and Norwich Mustard Cooperative, were not as detailed in the AI-generated version. These direct quotes emphasize the real-world application and perceived benefits more strongly in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of direct feedback from stakeholders in companies like Origo Ltd and The Lang Cat Ltd regarding operational changes and employee impacts (e.g., team cohesion and efficiency improvements, reflections on decision-making).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version emphasizes unique legal challenges encountered during QBM adoption (e.g., constraints under the Companies Act 2006), which the AI version does not address explicitly.

-----

"  
"5. Study Title : Hope 4 The Community CIC: Improving Lives of People Living with Long-Term Health Conditions by providing Self-Management Tools

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original REF submission highlights policy impact at national and international levels (e.g., UK policy and the US opioid management policy). It also emphasizes specific collaborations with Macmillan and various funding bodies such as The National Lottery Fund .

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed data on clinical trials, including participant numbers and longitudinal design for colorectal cancer and multiple sclerosis. - Commissioned projects by organizations like Macmillan Cancer Support and NHS participation.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts of national policy influence through the NHS implementation were less emphasized in the AI version. Also, REF specified partnerships like Macmillan Cancer Support, detailing their role in expanding self-management programs.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Detailed partnerships with Macmillan Cancer Support, 2) Specific metrics of improvement for cancer survivors, 3) UK policy influence specifics.

-----

"  
"6. Study Title : Localisation of Electricity Generation and Use

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific regulatory hurdles, like the ""complex site"" loophole, which allowed for peer-to-peer energy trading in Bethesda.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission explicitly mentions engagement with government bodies like Ofgem, and the regulatory work that facilitated local energy schemes. These are more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details on regulatory obstacles and direct interactions with entities such as Ofgem, and specifics of community benefits (e.g., credits in the form of vouchers).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific involvement of regulatory bodies like Ofgem and BEIS; detailed description of 'complex site' regulatory adaptations in the UK; exact timeline of pilot implementations and regional expansions, particularly in Wales.

"

"7. Study Title : Critical Connections pedagogical model based on multilingualism and digital storytelling boosts language learning and digital skills

Rater 1 Rating = 3: Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Partnerships with Cyprus, specific training and conferences held in multiple locations (e.g., Algeria, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Taiwan), feedback from the European Centre for Modern Languages, detailed examples of teacher and student reflections.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides in-depth details about partnerships with complementary schools in the UK and other nations, like Taiwan and Cyprus, and specific workshops that empowered educators.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific details such as direct quotes from stakeholders (e.g., teachers and international project participants), references to specific events like conferences and training dates, and partnerships with entities like the NRCSE.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF 2021 submission includes detailed accounts of the partnerships with specific educational institutions (e.g., Peace School, National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education) and feedback from international authorities, which are not covered in the AI-generated content.

"

"8. Study Title : Helping to Sustain the UK's Independent Film Industry Through an Improved Risk Management Strategy

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission specifically highlighted engagement with the British Film Institute and other industry bodies like DCMS. It also detailed recommendations made to improve the sector's approach to risk management, including blockchain technology's specific applications and precise quotes from industry reports.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes detailed stakeholder engagement strategies, including specific collaborations with industry organizations and proprietary data access that are not fully covered in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on the BFI report inclusion, influence on DCMS film budget allocations, and direct mentions of legislative consultations with the European Parliament.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific engagement outcomes, such as the direct citation in the British Film Institute report and targeted policy impacts, such as the £10 million Screen Unit support for data transparency in Scotland, are documented more comprehensively in the REF submission.

"

"9. Study Title : Changing practice and improving wellbeing through immersive vocal art

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission emphasizes specific engagements with institutions like Winchester Science Centre, and detailed evaluations of audience and user interactions with installations like the Voice Trunk, which are less explicit in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about the Resonant Tails project, particularly its impact on schools and disabled children's wellbeing.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific use of ""voice-expanding mirror"" in Resonant Tails. 2. Direct impact on KS1&2 curriculum integration. 3. Long-term impact statements from participating schools (e.g., Winchester Science Centre).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission elaborated on the project's specific impact on disabled youth, notably children with profound

learning disabilities, and highlighted the role of interactive installations in Science Centre settings.

---

"  
"10. Study Title : Safewards: Increasing Safety on Psychiatric Inpatient Wards  
Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific mentions of NHS England's CQUIN framework and Department of Health reports, which are crucial policy contributions but are not explicitly highlighted in the ChatGPT version. The exact percentage reductions in seclusion and restraints in specific NHS regions, like Sussex Partnership (63% decrease in seclusion), were also omitted.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some details regarding specific endorsements from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and the number of individual trusts and hospitals that implemented Safewards, including specific statistical reductions in seclusion and restraint in certain hospitals (e.g., Sussex Partnership and Greater Manchester Mental Health), were not mentioned in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed governmental endorsements (e.g., CQC, NIHR) and explicit references to implementation feedback (e.g., specific psychiatric wards and reduction metrics in seclusion).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of Safewards' adoption in individual UK healthcare trusts, detailed statistics on reduced containment metrics in particular NHS trusts.

---

"  
"11. Study Title : Contemporary documentary practices: historical perspective and interdisciplinary approaches - the International Research Centre for Interactive Storytelling (IRIS)  
Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific module names influenced by the research at Leeds Trinity (e.g., Transmedia Storytelling, Documentary Theory and Practice) were highlighted in the REF submission but not captured in the AI-generated version. The preservation of Japanese mediums and civic efforts to protect public spaces are more explicitly described in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of institutional collaborations, such as with Swinburne University, and the influence on module designs across other universities. Additionally, the REF mentions the safeguarding of cultural traditions through documentation, which is less emphasized in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Inclusion of module-specific impacts within Leeds Trinity and international universities, specifics on preserving the medium traditions in Japan, and detailed mention of regional political and cultural initiatives in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Modules in external institutions influenced by IRIS methods, specific collaborator roles in academic and public talks, and certain detailed impacts of documentary modules in practice at Leeds Trinity and other institutions.

---

"  
"12. Study Title : Improving patient outcomes through better project management of clinical trials  
Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific case studies from companies like LEO Pharma A/S and their cost-saving examples, which detail precise savings from eliminating change orders and schedule efficiencies.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder feedback, such as detailed metrics from Lundbeck and Blau Farmaceutica, and qualitative insights from GSK were emphasized in the REF version but not sufficiently covered by the AI-generated text.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific corporate

impacts (e.g., on LEO Pharma, H. Lundbeck A/S), precise KPIs, and details regarding the dissemination of the CURED framework to stakeholders at GSK.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed company-specific use cases (e.g., Lundbeck, Blau Farmaceutica) and quantitative metrics (cost and time savings).

---

"13. Study Title : Ensuring the Fair Treatment of Open Banking Customers

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission highlighted specific regulatory changes influenced by the research, such as FCA's guidance extensions and direct impacts on Payment Services Regulations, which were not fully covered in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of Whitley's role as co-chair of the Privacy and Consumer Advisory Group (PCAG) and certain policy implications such as changes in FCA guidance were detailed in the REF version but not in ChatGPT.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific FCA engagement timelines (e.g., presentations in Dec 2017 and ongoing consultations in 2019), the role of OBIE in implementing consent guidance, and explicit FCA principles were well-documented in the REF but not emphasized in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific FCA policies, dates of key regulatory changes (e.g., December 2017 presentations), and references to FSCP Position Papers.

---

"14. Study Title : Advancing Movement Practices in Doctoral and Professional Contexts

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides more granular detail on the specific institutions and individuals impacted, such as workshops in Brazil, Taiwan, and detailed artist feedback.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version did not emphasize the international reach to specific institutions like UNICAMP in Brazil or York University in Canada, which were highlighted in the REF submission. Furthermore, specific examples of artists and educators utilizing the CAP method, such as Cheryl LaFrance at York University, were omitted.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborative initiatives (e.g., ADiE's impact on Nordic countries) and particular feedback from stakeholders (e.g., Dance4 Director's perspective on PaR integration).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version uniquely highlights CAP's influence in specific global locations (e.g., Brazil, Taiwan, Argentina), and its adaptation in disciplines like skateboarding and working with children in care, which are not captured in the AI version.

---

"15. Study Title : Digital Twin Specification, Design and Application

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples like the partnership with the Ministry of Transport in Vietnam for structural health monitoring, the development of the TwinX™ product, and specific financial savings (e.g., £1.5 million in repair costs for the Thăng Long bridge) were not mentioned in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific proof-of-concept demonstrations for clients such as VodafoneZiggo and the COVID-19 pandemic model implemented by TCS using the Java TwinX™ Library are more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed instances such as the specific applications in COVID-19 modeling for pandemic response in Pune and documented collaborations with Vietnamese government agencies for infrastructure maintenance are missing from the AI content.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specifics about TCS's influence on the Model Driven Organization (MDO) strategy. 2. Annual sabbatical residencies and collaborative development of enterprise modeling technology. 3. The direct influence of LEAP on TCS's strategic client interactions and decision-making support technology.

---

"

"16. Study Title : Being in Touch: Inspiring Cultural Engagement through Creative-Critical Writing

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific outputs like ""Every Little Touch,"" collaborations with BT Archives, and detailed community engagement statistics (e.g., participation in the UNESCO Creative Cities workshops).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnerships with the BT Archives, involvement in Science Museum (SM) events, and contributions to UNESCO Creative Cities. The ChatGPT version did not include this institutional detail .

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Detailed examples of specific media engagements, such as BBC broadcasts and AHRC impact studies. - Audience metrics and participant feedback from events like the BA-AHRC Being Human Festival. - Direct comments from community and institutional partners on cultural impact.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific listener metrics (e.g., 7 million listeners on BBC) and details on individual participant feedback from workshops (expressions of empowerment and artistic inspiration).

---

"

"17. Study Title : Shaping crime prevention policy and strategy to sustain the crime drop and reduce domestic burglary

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed mentions of the House of Commons Justice Select Committee report and its influence on national policy, the creation of the Safer Street Funds, and the Neighbourhood Watch Network strategy.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details of the Home Office's Modern Crime Prevention Strategy (2016) and involvement in the Residential Burglary Taskforce were more emphasized in the REF version, while these details were more generalized in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of advisory groups and individual policy impacts, like the ""Residential Burglary Taskforce"" details.

Rater 4 Rating = [4] Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF 2021 provides more detailed instances of policy citations, such as specific contributions to House of Commons Justice Select Committee and Home Office policy responses, which were not explicitly included in ChatGPT's version.

---

"

"18. Study Title : Building local socio-economic impacts into the assessment of major energy projects

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Specific stakeholder feedback from local authorities (e.g., Somerset County Council) on workforce increases and local housing policies. 2) Monitoring outcomes at specific construction phases of Hinkley Point C (HPC). 3) Detailed auditing system and color-coding framework used by the local councils.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific local authority engagements (e.g., Somerset and Suffolk councils), detailed government agency involvement, and direct project management changes.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about local government interactions and direct quotes from stakeholders were missing in the AI-generated content.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed financial figures (e.g., GBP1,500,000 for certain projects), specific timelines, and certain local council stakeholder names.

---

"  
"19. Study Title : Strengthening global and national policies on performance-based and innovative health financing in low-income and fragile settings

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission explicitly details engagement with specific stakeholders like the Global Fund and provides more examples of direct invitations for expert consultations. For instance, it discusses Witter's involvement with the Global Fund for health system strengthening in complex operating environments (COEs), which ChatGPT does not cover.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examples from Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone. Collaboration with the Global Fund and DfID, and specific WHO guidelines were omitted in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF version includes specific references to targeted meetings and webinars with stakeholder groups like the PBF community and WHO's technical training, which were not detailed in the ChatGPT version.

Additionally, the REF submission specifies the contextual development of PBF strategies in fragile settings, such as the tailored consultation with the Global Fund.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific reference to the Global Fund's complex operating environment strategy for HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria, and the tailored investment guidelines used by the Global Fund's Technical Review Panels.

---

"  
"20. Study Title : Transforming the Accessibility and Discoverability of Millions of Archival Television Programmes

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version emphasizes historical technology restoration and ""hands-on history"" methods, which are essential to understanding analog TV production, an aspect not as clearly presented in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations with European partners, detailed figures about the number of programmes accessible through BoB, and intricate descriptions of technological innovations such as the bespoke search functions.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific roles of RHUL in metadata standardization and partnership building across European archives.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborative relationships, such as RHUL's partnership with the European Research Council, and detailed technical aspects of metadata standardization were emphasized in the REF submission but less detailed in the AI content.

---

"  
"21. Study Title : Improving quality of life for patients with Parkinson's disease

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides specific details on the role of expert witnesses and NICE health economic analyses, which are not mentioned in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct mention of the NICE guidelines and specific trial contributions.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific NICE guideline changes, use of expert witness testimony in guideline development, patient data requests for economic evaluation, and precise health economics analysis outcomes

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission

emphasizes the precise NICE recommendations, such as Recommendation 26 and 89, specific quality of life metrics (PDQ-39, EQ-5D), and patient follow-up data for health economic analysis. These specifics were not mirrored in the AI-generated content.

---

"

"22. Study Title : Improving Treatment for Women Suffering from Endometrial Hyperplasia

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides more detailed statistics on the percentage increase in treatment adoption, specific quotes from patients, and the guideline changes in Hong Kong that were not mentioned in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = [Rating: 4]

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Patient testimonials and specific UK statistics (e.g., percentage increase in treatment uptake and fertility preservation data).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Changes in patient treatment acceptance rates over time, detailed statistics of clinical guideline modifications, and exact metrics of guideline influence across organizations like RCOG, BSGE, and HKC.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed acceptance rates of LNG-IUS vs. oral progestogens, specific percentage changes across diagnostic periods, and patient testimonials on quality-of-life improvements.

---

"

"23. Study Title : Heritage of the first farmers

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more detailed accounts of local stakeholder quotes (e.g., villagers acknowledging the site's historical importance). It also includes specific feedback from museum visitors and teachers, which the AI version lacks.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quotes from local villagers and museum staff acknowledging the project's contribution to heritage protection and education. Detailed information on visitor feedback regarding the educational materials and the training of museum staff.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quotes from local stakeholders and detailed examples from Konya Museums Director, such as remarks on "site preservation and outreach" and the "importance of artifacts to Konya's new museum initiatives."

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Unique testimonies from visitors, and specific acknowledgments of contributions by local community figures such as the museum director.

---

"

"24. Study Title : Mathematical modelling of an aneurysm sealing system triggers patient safety policy that withdraws surgical practice from the NHS

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific patient data, such as the number of patients (e.g., 837 patients receiving safer alternatives, 611 patients fitted with the Nellix system, etc.). These detailed statistics are missing in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 2 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific dates and timelines related to the regulatory actions (e.g., the exact date of withdrawal) were more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific NHS withdrawal policies and enhanced monitoring requirements for patients fitted with the Nellix EVAS system. Mention of specific UK hospital statistics and surgeon testimonials validating the research.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific statistics on rupture rates and comparative failure rates between Nellix EVAS and other procedures (e.g.,

50% failure rate, mortality rates). Testimonies from surgeons and their practice adjustments following the research.

---

"  
"25. Study Title : Financial and efficiency improvements from socio-technical digitalization of costing and procurement in the built environment

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed mention of financial savings by contractors, specific feedback from organizations like Willmott Dixon (WD) and NG Bailey (NGB), and the adoption of value-based procurement in government departments are present in the REF submission but absent in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to savings percentages (e.g., 2% savings in procured packages at Willmott Dixon) and exact stakeholder quotes from industry leaders such as the commercial director of WD.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific naming of stakeholders like Willmott Dixon and NG Bailey, direct influence on government entities through the ""Procuring for Value"" report, and measurable financial impacts through exact figures like cost savings for individual contractors.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific financial impact estimates for NG Bailey; the role of key stakeholders like the Global Chair of RLB in advancing the Procuring for Value framework; secondary effects within the broader supply chain network.

---

"  
"26. Study Title : Evaluating Effectiveness

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impact examples such as Cartwright's involvement with CEDIL, the role of 'middle-range theory' in policy documents, and work with the Academy of Medical Sciences are more explicitly detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provided detailed case-specific examples from Cartwright's work on child protection and mental health, including her role in psychotherapy evaluations and NICE policy contributions, which were less prominent in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some specific influences on international policy frameworks, detailed under Cartwright's work with institutions like CEDIL, were less prominent in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed testimonies from stakeholders in international development, specifics on middle-range theory applications in individual documents, direct quotes from CEDIL associates highlighting Cartwright's unique influence.

---

"  
"27. Study Title : Seeing beyond the wheelchair: Pioneering education and higher aspiration promotion for boys and men with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnerships with Duchenne UK and European Neuromuscular Centre, detailed examples of policy-driven changes.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific statistics about the number of copies of the guide sold, direct engagements with the UK's legislative and health systems, and some specific examples of advocacy work, such as parliamentary engagements during COVID-19, which were less explicitly mentioned in the AI-generated content. For example, the REF describes the number of trained professionals and educational workshops in detail.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative data on the number of workshops and engagement statistics with stakeholders such as parents and clinicians. Mention of collaborative conferences.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics of the "Support Through Lockdown" initiative and detailed figures on family engagement through Deciphia CIC workshops and webinars were absent from the ChatGPT version.

---

"  
"28. Study Title : The Coffee Historian: Achieving Impact Through Industry Collaboration, Education, and Public Engagement

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more specific examples of collaborations, such as the creation of educational materials and contributions to Nespresso's e-learning programs. The ChatGPT version does not mention this educational work with the same depth.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about the extent of Morris's involvement with public and media engagement (e.g., BBC Radio 4, podcasts) were more thoroughly documented in the REF submission but not as prominently in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations with Ecocafe for regulatory support, FAEMA's heritage promotion, and detailed audience reach (e.g., podcast downloads and specific event names).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborative details with Nestle-Nespresso on Italian coffee culture and the FAEMA E-71 heritage branding contributions.

---

"  
"29. Study Title : Discovering Ted Hughes's Yorkshire

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations, such as with Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council and Doncaster Culture and Leisure Trust and the creation of the Ted Hughes Network (THN), which have driven cultural projects, were not mentioned by ChatGPT. The formalized consortium, as well as the contribution of this research to local tourism and place-making (like the creation of trails and workshops), were detailed in the REF submission but less emphasized in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the ""Tourism Officer of CMBC,"" the ""Mayor of Hebden Royd,"" and the direct economic impact on tourism are missing. Testimonials from community leaders and beneficiaries that demonstrate the social and economic regeneration efforts due to Ted Hughes's heritage work are absent in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific engagement metrics (e.g., attendance figures), detailed organizational partnerships (e.g., specific councils like Calderdale), and explicit citations of stakeholder quotes from local government officials.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impact on the Hebden Royd community through flood recovery initiatives and mental health impacts from cultural engagement are not explicitly referenced in the ChatGPT version.

---

"  
"30. Study Title : Empowering Indigenous Self-Representation for the Emberá People of Panama

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific legal impacts, particularly in assisting the Emberá with their land claims, supported by Theodosopoulos's genealogical and historical data, which is not extensively discussed in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific mention of 2018 land claim efforts involving a Danish NGO (Forests of the World) and genealogical support for the Panamanian government was detailed in the REF submission but not clearly articulated in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details of

collaboration with the Danish NGO, Forests of the World, and specifics of the final land claim submission to Panamanian authorities are present in the REF but not in the AI-generated version.

Rater 4 Rating = [4] Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Legal precedents and genealogical evidence in land claims.

---

"

"31. Study Title : Enhancing Understanding of the Foreign and Security Policy Implications of Brexit for Government and the Wider Policy Community

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific parliamentary engagements, quotes from MPs like Hilary Benn, and direct involvement in policy briefings for the Foreign Office and Ministry of Defence. The REF submission details the exact mechanisms of policy influence, such as specific committee evidence sessions, which are less clear in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific instances of parliamentary contributions, like oral evidence to select committees, and detailed interactions with overseas diplomatic missions. These were not mentioned in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: AI version does not mention specific collaborations with think tanks like Chatham House, or specific instances of Whitman's involvement with EU foreign policy committees, which are highlighted in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of parliamentary select committee appearances, like the Foreign Affairs Committee and direct references to testimonials by government officials, are missing.

---

"

"32. Study Title : Worldwide Improvements in Policing due to Increased Sales of Facial Composite Software

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version mentions specific user testimonials from police officers in Sweden, Canada, and South Africa, along with precise system usage statistics (e.g., 378 systems used in 25 countries, including France and Bangladesh). These detailed case studies provide a deeper narrative on the actual influence of the software.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific police force testimonials and quantitative data on the software's adoption in different countries were more prominent in the REF submission. The detailed user feedback from forces like South Africa and Sweden, and examples of case outcomes (like the Beeston rape case), were omitted in the AI-generated report.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: National-level feedback, specific adoption rates in various constabularies, and certain user testimonials detailing operational improvements.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific endorsements from individual police forces (e.g., South Africa, Sweden) and specific feedback on working practice changes are not as emphasized.

---

"

"33. Study Title : Improving the Physical Wellbeing of the Police Force

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes detailed accounts of stakeholder quotes and program statistics, like the exact number of participants and health outcomes measured (e.g., peak flow, grip strength improvements).

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific involvement of Chief Constable Skelly and the detailed recruitment process for mentors.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Integration of wellbeing into police force policy, specific reference to Chief Constable Skelly's role, and

detailed evaluation of program metrics.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Dr. Henderson's specific role in writing the handbook, individual feedback from participants, and precise details about oversubscription of the program.

---

"

"34. Study Title : Raising Maori students' achievement in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version places more emphasis on the relationships between schools and Māori communities and provides detailed statistics on how Māori student engagement and retention improved (e.g., 90% of principals identified improvements in academic achievement, and detailed examples of principal engagement with KEP initiatives).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed quantitative data on teacher observations (e.g., 1,451 teacher observations, and follow-up coaching sessions for teachers), the percentages of schools that reported adopting specific goals (e.g., 90% of KEP schools), and evaluations by independent education bodies such as the NZ Ministry of Education.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details such as the specific percentages of schools setting objectives, conducting observations, and participation levels in shadow coaching sessions were present in the REF but not in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Shadow coaching sessions, specific quantitative impacts like the increase in NCEA attainment rates (e.g., 7% and 20% improvements), and the extensive teacher observation metrics (1,451 observations) were not fully detailed in the AI version.

---

"

"35. Study Title : Improving patient outcomes and treatment guidelines through the study of Hepatitis C

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission details specific stakeholder engagements, such as partnerships with pharmaceutical companies and direct outcomes like the Early Access Programme (EAP) for HCV patients, which led to measurable declines in liver transplants and mortality rates.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes more specific quotes from industry leaders and government figures, such as direct input from pharmaceutical companies and national health leaders about early access to DAAs. These detailed testimonies add an element of authority that the AI version lacks.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included direct impacts on patient virological outcomes and specific DAA statistics, such as the treatment success rate of 90% for 711 patients (page 266) and the PHE report's documented reductions in mortality and transplants.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impact metrics like the 38.9% decrease in HCV-related liver transplants, in-depth details on the national collaborations, and particular studies like HepCATT.

---

"

"36. Study Title : Improving Homecare Quality in the UK Through Optimized Workforce Planning

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes details about OptifAI's role during COVID-19 and its societal benefits, such as the ability to quickly adapt schedules to pandemic-related absences.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Acquisition by Access Group, specific cost savings by clients.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Acquisition by Access Group, specific operational efficiencies like reduced travel costs, and acquisition

outcomes.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts on public funding policy and certain aspects of Access Group's acquisition of Webroster were less detailed in the AI-generated content.

---

"

"37. Study Title : Transforming vaccine policy for pneumococcal disease leading to significant cost savings in the NHS

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission elaborates on specific studies, such as the CAPITA study (randomized controlled trial), and details from the Rodrigo et al. 2015 paper used by JCVI for policy decisions. This granular detail is not found in the ChatGPT version, which lacks explicit references to these specific studies.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed description of the JCVI's decision-making process, cost savings specifics (£233 million).

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts on NHS cost savings, NHS vaccine procurement, and the decision-making processes of JCVI are detailed in the REF but are generalized in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed interactions with UK policy bodies like JCVI, specific longitudinal data implications for CAP and the cost-effective aspects that supported policy adjustments.

---

"

"38. Study Title : UoP32Househistories: A House Through Time: Shaping a flagship TV series to achieve critical and financial success and inspiring the public to engage with house history

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific audience viewing metrics (e.g., ""over 32 million hours of AHTT watched""), detailed involvement with archival material, specific awards/nominations for the series, and direct quotes from stakeholders that reflect the research's contribution to visual flair and historical accuracy.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides detailed examples of industry accolades and specific viewer statistics that contributed to BBC Two's success, which are not fully captured in the AI-generated version. Additionally, the role of Professor Ryan's collaboration with genealogical sites like FindMyPast, and specific mentions of interviews and talks, are absent in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct contributions to series episodes, details of collaborations with BBC producers, and specific mentions of audience ratings and awards (e.g., Grierson Awards).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission uniquely highlights specific awards and nominations (e.g., Grierson Trust British Documentary Awards) and specific viewership statistics per episode, which contribute to understanding the series' reach.

---

"

"39. Study Title : Optimising baggage operations at London Heathrow Airport to achieve cost savings for the aviation industry

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific cost savings achieved at Heathrow (e.g., saving over £20 million in capital expenditure), the direct collaboration with Arup and Heathrow, and real-time optimization techniques that prevented the need for additional baggage reclaim capacity.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. The REF submission discussed the detailed application of combinatorial optimization in dynamic scheduling algorithms more thoroughly (e.g., real-time adjustments based on flight delays). 2. Specific cost-saving amounts (e.g., £20 million in Capex savings) were emphasized in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some specific stakeholder perspectives, like operational costs for airports and passenger convenience factors, were emphasized in the REF submission but not in the AI-generated version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific insights into Heathrow's preference for dynamic allocation systems and avoidance of a fixed allocation model, which were critical to their operational strategies, were not detailed in the AI version.

---

"

"40. Study Title : POWeR - Cost-effective online support for weight management

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details regarding contracts with local authorities, dissemination activities, and the ESRC Impact Acceleration funding were mentioned in the REF submission but not captured in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed contractual agreements with specific local health authorities, the precise terms of the Innovate UK grant for converting POWeR into a web app, and specific quotes from council testimonials were missing in the AI-generated content. Additionally, the AI did not fully cover the exact processes of ESRC Impact Acceleration funding.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on dissemination through exclusive licensing contracts with Changing Health and specific stakeholder testimonials (e.g., Hampshire County Council, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Hampshire County Council, Solent NHS Trust, and Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council contracts, detailed dissemination methods, specific policy engagement with Public Health England and Department of Health.

---

"

"41. Study Title : The global impact of Sunderland's football research on scouting, training, and player preparation in elite football

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to organizations such as UEFA, FIFA, and the English Football Association, and details about studies conducted by or in partnership with major clubs like Manchester United, Barcelona, and Liverpool.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission mentions direct collaborations with FIFA and UEFA, particularly in shaping their sports science and injury prevention protocols. These aspects were less explicitly covered in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of UEFA, FIFA's Women's World Cup, and the FA's adaptation of Sunderland's research are absent in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific contributions to the FIFA Women's World Cup analysis, exact national football federations involved, and details on UEFA injury studies.

---

"

"42. Study Title : Adding value to convenience retailing through improved pricing, a new store concept, and capacity building

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific data points like the exact increase in sales percentages (e.g., the 9.1% sales increase) and awards received by the store concept were omitted in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed sales data, such as the 9.1% increase in sales within 15 months and the 50-100% increase in foodservice sales, were not fully captured. 2. Specific accolades, such as the ""Shop of the Year"" award, were not included in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on ""price manager role creation,"" exact sales metrics post-implementation (e.g., 9.1% sales increase), and detailed stakeholder testimonials were absent in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF includes detailed metrics on sales increases (e.g., 9.1% general sales rise), awards received, and direct testimonials from corporate leaders, providing concrete data on the new store concept's success and its commercial effects.

---

"  
"43. Study Title : Transforming Evidence-Based Practice in Public Health Through Co-Production and Evaluation

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to policy re-commissioning (e.g., CREE men's shed project cited in policy documents) were mentioned in the REF submission but not in the ChatGPT version. - Exact quantitative data on program outcomes (e.g., number of participants in the teenage parent support program) were omitted in the AI-generated content.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific policy citations, such as the "Making Mental Health Everybody's Business" guide and Public Health England's references to the real-time suicide alert system pilot. These are critical examples of how research directly informed policy at various governmental levels.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific program impacts, like the teenage parent support initiative, and comprehensive descriptions of follow-up evaluations are less emphasized.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version specifically emphasizes the continued impact on DCC policies, including the formal incorporation of research-informed evaluations as part of public health practices. Additionally, the AI version does not fully elaborate on the expanded role of co-production in policy development as detailed in the REF.

---

"  
"44. Study Title : Well-being and Public Policy

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed interaction with ONS (e.g., Oswald's role in improving well-being data reporting). - Specific policy contributions, such as involvement in the Green Book update in 2018. - Influence on international well-being reports like the World Happiness Reports.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific examples like the extensive citation of Oswald's work in the 2011 DWP and HM Treasury report on well-being, as well as his consultation role in the 2018 Green Book preparation. Additionally, personal testimonies from officials like Omar Idriss highlight Oswald's direct input in policy drafting, which adds depth to the impact of his work.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of Oswald's impact on European Commission initiatives and extensive advisory role on national well-being frameworks were detailed in the REF version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific events: 2013 talk at HM Treasury, 2014 GES event, 2017 Treasury Teach-In, and mentions of the detailed collaborations with ONS on specific publications were omitted.

---

"  
"45. Study Title : Improving the quality of green infrastructure in towns and cities in the UK

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed partnerships (e.g., with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust), specific policy outcomes like Newcastle City Council's Building with Nature training, and the inclusion of Building with Nature in the National Design Guide.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission emphasizes specific collaborations, the creation of Building with Nature, and various regional

impacts, which were only partially detailed in the AI-generated text.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included specific mentions of funding sources (e.g., NERC funding) and direct quotes from local government officials, which provide direct context to the initiative's reception and impact on public authorities.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit partnerships, including Newcastle City Council and GWT's involvement in green infrastructure policies and standards.

"

"46. Study Title : Redressing the state of the stateless: seeking political recognition for Tibet and Kashmir

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The personal social media abuse suffered by Anand and Kaul, their direct involvement in solidarity work, and the challenges they faced were highlighted in the REF submission but not captured by ChatGPT.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides granular details about the specific legal cases (such as the "TG" case in the Upper Tribunal) and the acceptance of expert testimony by UK tribunals. These legal precedents are crucial but were not mentioned in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some specific cases, such as the landmark ""TG"" asylum case and US Congress House Resolution 745 tied to Kashmir, were not explicitly referenced in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific case references, e.g., ""TG"" asylum case (2016) and the particular influence of Kaul's congressional testimony on U.S. policy dialogues, are detailed in the REF but summarized in the AI version.

"

"47. Study Title : Evidence-based enteral feeding practices for very preterm or very low birth weight infants

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts such as citations of WHO guidelines and other policy statements like those from the AAP and CCG were highlighted in the REF submission but were not explicitly detailed in the AI-generated content.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version explicitly references the WHO guidelines and national health organizations such as the American Academy of Pediatrics and European Association of Perinatal Medicine. The ChatGPT version lacks direct references to these guidelines, weakening its precision in policy impact.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Policy citation examples for AAP, CCG, and EAPM guidelines, direct references to Health Scotland's report and Massachusetts project on improved patient outcomes.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific WHO guidelines, such as those regarding "Standard Formula for Low Birth Weight Infants" and in-depth mentions of national-level influences, including AAP, CCG, and EAPM guidelines.

"

"48. Study Title : Improving Environmental Conservation in East Africa and Beyond

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission emphasizes specific policy influences, like the creation of the Magombera Nature Reserve, which was not highlighted as prominently in the ChatGPT version. Additionally, the role of specific NGOs and governmental bodies is better detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed accounts of local community agreements for forest conservation. 2. Specific statistics regarding village knowledge improvement and species reclassifications.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed economic support for local communities, collaboration specifics with local and international NGOs, and local employment benefits through conservation initiatives.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Specific reduction in illegal firewood collection measurements; 2) Downgrading of a monkey species on the IUCN Red List; 3) Detailed economic contributions to local communities through tourism revenue.

---

"

"49. Study Title : Predicting the properties of materials with first-principles electronic structure software (CASTEP)

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of industrial collaboration (e.g., Honda, Panasonic) and patent support by CASTEP are absent in the AI-generated version. Additionally, the detailed financial impact, like the 8:1 ROI reported in the REF, is missing.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific case studies of CASTEP's application in industrial settings, such as the detailed explanations of how companies like Panasonic and Honda used the software in product development, are present in the REF submission but were less explicitly detailed in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF explicitly highlights CASTEP's commercial success, specific industrial applications (Honda, Toshiba, Panasonic), and training contributions for scientists.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific ROI metrics (e.g., 8:1) and examples such as exact percentages of deviation in alloy predictions for Honda, and detailed data about user training workshops.

---

"

"50. Study Title : Statistical pattern recognition applied to protein crystallisation images in the pharmaceutical industry

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of AstraZeneca's Crystal Atlas and the integration of MARCO into AstraZeneca's systems were mentioned in the REF submission but were less explicitly covered in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed contributions of specific companies (AstraZeneca, Merck, etc.) and the MARCO project's integration into industrial workflows are mentioned explicitly in the REF version but are less specific in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific names of pharmaceutical companies like Merck and AstraZeneca and their direct testimonials on MARCO software were highlighted in REF but not explicitly in AI content.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific software implementations and collaborations, such as the MARCO classifier integration into Formulatrix's ROCK MAKER, and detailed stakeholder endorsements by companies like GSK.

---

"

"51. Study Title : 'Moving beyond one-size-fits-all: Improving Widening Participation through Realist Evaluation methodologies in Northern England'

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed feedback loops in RE practice with stakeholders (e.g., educators and policymakers) and emphasis on contextual adaptation of WP programs. Specific WP practices such as 'Affective and Effective Mentoring' and community-centered evaluation practices. (REF submission: [8] pages 3.3, 3.5)

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes specific mentions of external commendations from the Office for Students (OfS) for the RE approach and detailed statistical evidence on progression rates in the identified areas. Additionally, there is more emphasis on the unique challenges of different wards in West Yorkshire and specific staff interventions (e.g., role models and community workers).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific program theories like 'Affective and Effective Mentoring' and 'Role of Role Models,' as well as unique regional insights and exact contextual adaptations of program theories.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI-generated report did not include details on the granular impact of RE methodologies on specific community-based WP metrics, such as ""43% rate of progression matching national average"" or the commendations received from the Office for Students (OfS) for Phase Two reporting.

"

"52. Study Title : Challenging monolithic conceptualisations of English for learning, teaching and assessment: The Changing Englishes online course

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission specifically highlights various practical implementations, like the ""Changing Englishes"" course and the engagement of over 4,000 users globally, which is not fully detailed in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes detailed statistics on course reach and user engagement (e.g., number of visitors, country distribution, and certificate completion rates). ChatGPT's version did not include these specifics.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific user testimonials and applications in particular countries, such as Iraq, Kazakhstan, and Nigeria; detailed data on user engagement and course completion rates from the British Council-hosted course.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of educator testimonials and in-depth references to regional adaptations of the course (e.g., usage in Riga, Business University workshops) are present in the REF submission but omitted in the AI version.

"

"53. Study Title : Robert Paul and the Origins of British Cinema

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides a more detailed account of specific public engagement activities, such as exhibitions, community talks, and the popularization of Robert Paul through physical events like Forgotten Showman.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details of specific exhibitions such as ""Forgotten Showman"" and community engagement activities like the comic creation and local talks in North London. Specific films identified or restored, including ""The Fatal Hand"" and contributions to the Swedish Film Institute, are also not deeply explored in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct references to the Guardian's article on Britain's film history and mentions of specific exhibitions, like the "Forgotten Showman" exhibition at the National Science and Media Museum, were noted in the REF but not in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific film titles discovered (e.g., The Pocket Boxers, The Fatal Hand), partnerships with BFI and Swedish Film Institute, details on local exhibitions, and contextual specifics like feedback from museum audiences.

"

"54. Study Title : The Care and Management of Gout in Primary Care

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: NICE guidelines citation, patient-facing materials like Healthtalk.org.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to guidelines from NICE, BSR, and EULAR, along with the exact changes in pharmacological recommendations, are explicitly cited in the REF submission. The AI version lacks detailed

references to these precise guidelines.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific collaborations with UK health organizations, like the NICE accreditation of the BSR guidelines. 2. Specific regional data applications in North Staffordshire and South Cheshire regarding practice nurse-led consultations.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Mentions of specific guidelines updates by EULAR and NICE and references to practice changes prompted by Arthritis Care surveys and direct public engagement initiatives (e.g., Gout Awareness Month).

"

"55. Study Title : From Victims to Actors: Shifting the Policy Paradigm to Value Children's Contribution in Disaster Risk Management

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission specifically mentioned children's engagement at major conferences like the Environment Agency Flood & Coast conference and political engagements (e.g., All-Party Parliamentary Group on Flooding), which the AI version did not reflect.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to the involvement of regional councils like Surrey County, the British Damage Management Association's adoption of research findings, and the educational frameworks created for teachers.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of UK-centric policies, BBC Radio features, and precise quotes from child participants conveying their sense of agency and the impact on their self-perception as active citizens.

Rater 4 Rating = 5

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit engagements with organizations like Save the Children, national disaster agencies, and local councils were well-documented in the REF but less detailed in the AI version. Specific workshops and forums such as the British Damage Management Association and the Environment Agency Flood & Coast Conference are noted in REF but missing in the AI-generated text.

"

"56. Study Title : Improved Crab Fisheries Management Benefits Coastal Livelihoods in Brazil

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission gives precise details about the involvement of specific Brazilian government bodies, such as SAP/MAPA and ICMBio. It also provides a timeline of legislative changes and stakeholder engagement that is more specific. It includes testimonies from local fishery managers and actual email quotes from stakeholders, providing a higher degree of credibility and specificity.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original submission highlighted the engagement with specific Brazilian government bodies like SAP/MAPA and ICMBio, with a detailed timeline of legislative changes that were not as extensively covered in the AI version. The socio-political intricacies and stakeholder feedback were also emphasized more in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details of specific stakeholder engagements, such as the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation and direct quotes from beneficiaries; timeline specifics of legislation (e.g., SAP/MAPA requests and actions in specific years).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to ICMBio, SAP/MAPA, and local policy impact outcomes, including cost savings in law enforcement and compliance rates among fishers.

"

"57. Study Title : Influencing Organisational Strategy to Support Responsible Business Practice

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific details about events like the Responsible Business Forum in 2016 and precise numbers of signatories (e.g., increase from 200 to 500) are mentioned only in the REF submission. This kind of detailed contextual information is absent in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the Charity Board Initiative, detailed outcomes from the Scotland CAN B program, and the involvement of Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce in winning the CAN B designation for Edinburgh.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific contributions to the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce Inspiring Communities Group and the details of the Scottish Business Pledge's growth due to the Responsible Business Forum were not highlighted in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnership details, such as exact organization names supporting the Scottish Business Pledge, and the extended impact of programs on corporate structure, were limited in the AI version.

---

"

"58. Study Title : Billmonitor: predicting the best mobile phone contract for businesses and individual users

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Precise savings amounts for businesses and public sector organizations, such as GBP31 million for private customers and GBP6 million for businesses. - Testimonials from public figures and specific coverage from media outlets like MoneySuperMarket and Martin S. Lewis.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific economic impacts like the exact amount of savings for businesses and consumers, partnerships with media outlets, and endorsements from authorities like MoneySuperMarket and Ofcom.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific NHS benefits, detailed percentage savings for SMEs, and public endorsement by entities like MoneySuperMarket.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific data on user savings, the NHS's role as a major beneficiary, and Ofcom's accreditation details are highlighted in the REF submission but are missing in the AI-generated version.

---

"

"59. Study Title : Mediating Modern German: reaching new and diverse audiences through translation, engagement, and performance

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific collaborations with the British Library, Poetry Society, and other organizations. 2. Judging poetry competitions, especially for young people. 3. Appearances on BBC platforms and specific comments from collaborators (e.g., ""her intimate experience of translation issues"").

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific recognition (awards, judging roles), involvement in poetry festivals (e.g., Cheltenham, Edinburgh), and detailed collaboration with broadcasters (BBC) and arts organizations are not fully captured in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Involvement with organizations like the Stephen Spender Trust and Poetry Trust; specific festivals (e.g., Cheltenham, Edinburgh) and roles, such as judging translation competitions; specific BBC program appearances (e.g., Open Book, BBC Proms).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific awards (e.g., Board positions, poetry translation competitions), detailed festival and event participation.

---

"

"60. Study Title : OMass Therapeutics: New technology for drug discovery with economic benefit to the UK

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about the creation of OMass Therapeutics, the company's growth in staff numbers, exact investment amounts, and specific awards received by the company (e.g., Innovate UK award) are mentioned in the REF version but not fully captured in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details about specific financial milestones like GBP1,100,000 from Oxford Sciences Innovation and Syncona's involvement with OMass Technologies were deeply discussed in the REF submission but were either broadly mentioned or missing in the ChatGPT-generated content.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details about external investments, acquisition of Excellerate, and specific client relationships of OMass were not mentioned in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details regarding investment rounds, award numbers, and full-time employee growth were highlighted in the REF submission but only briefly noted in the AI-generated version.

---

"

"61. Study Title : Living With Feeling: Transforming Understandings of Emotional Health

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details such as the BBC podcast's audience reach (2.5 million listeners), the download metrics for ""The Sound of Anger"" series (178,500 views), and the collaborative development of exhibitions with RCN.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included detailed examples of partnerships (e.g., Royal College of Nursing, TKAT collaboration, and specific metrics of audience reach like podcast listenership and exhibition attendance). These specific engagement metrics and stakeholder reactions were not fully mentioned in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific events like the ""Free Thinking Festival"" and precise viewership metrics for media engagements are absent.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version specifies detailed program names, such as The Sound of Anger podcast, and the exact number of views, downloads, and nominations, which are less emphasized in the ChatGPT version.

---

"

"62. Study Title : Litigation as a Tool to Support Social Change: Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights, and Legal Empowerment

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific case studies like the Batwa case in DRC are detailed in the REF submission but are not mentioned explicitly in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details regarding the procedural history of the Namibian court case and specific mention of the role of the Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) are missing in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific case outcomes, such as the ongoing Namibia case, the role of OSJI in adopting climate justice objectives, and the Batwa case in Congo.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details on the San-Hai

---

"

"63. Study Title : Accelerating the development of medicines for children through an open-access excipient database

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Mention of specific companies such as Eli Lilly and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's sponsorships for excipients. - Proveca's specific regulatory outcomes and economic benefits for excipient minimization.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quantitative data about the number of global users (3000+ from 44 countries), company endorsements from Eli Lilly, and detailed financial savings from Proveca's use of the database (e.g., GBP 1,000,000).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific pharmaceutical companies (Eli Lilly, Sanofi) and Proveca's use case examples, explicit impact on pediatric medicine policy (EMA's adoption of STEP database insights).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct endorsements from companies like Eli Lilly, specific regulatory approvals facilitated by STEP, such as the EMA interactions, and quantifiable metrics of user engagement (e.g., number of users and countries represented)

---

"

"64. Study Title : Pluralistic Evidence for Successful Policymaking about Reactive Systems

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific involvement of organizations like IARC and NICE, and the detailed process of changing their evidence assessment frameworks through direct consultation, is more extensively described in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In the REF submission, there are more specific references to particular agencies like NICE, and concrete examples of consultations with bodies such as the NHS England and Alan Turing Institute, which are either summarized or absent in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes specific references to NICE's guideline sections and committee roles in integrating evidence of mechanism.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific policy adjustments influenced by the EBM+ project in NICE/IARC and details of ethics frameworks shaped in direct consultations with the UK government (e.g., Cabinet Office, DCMS).

---

"

"65. Study Title : Reshaping professional heritage practice and changing understanding of heritage in the UK and internationally

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Workshops at Kew Gardens, Orford Ness, and the Heritage Futures exhibition at Manchester Museum, along with specific testimonials from professionals (e.g., IUCN, Kew Gardens staff).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific workshop details, such as the Kew Gardens and Orford Ness events, and their precise impact on specific organizations like the National Trust, were omitted from the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnerships and detailed workshop events with organizations like Kew Gardens, National Trust, and IUCN were emphasized in the REF version but were not detailed in the AI-generated version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details on workshops with Kew Gardens, Orford Ness, and the collaboration with the Alan Turing Institute, which provided tailored CPD opportunities. Furthermore, the international reach involving advisory board members from UNESCO, IUCN, and ICOMOS, is more extensively detailed in the REF.

---

"

"66. Study Title : Shaping the legal framework for Brexit

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more specific details regarding parliamentary debates and committee proceedings, such as references to the House of Lords Select Committee and quotes from Lord Pannick QC, which are not as thoroughly represented in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed account of specific public figures (e.g., Baroness Smith) and the immediate political reactions to the Article 50 debate are more thoroughly covered in the REF submission. Also, the REF version has a precise account of the Supreme Court's role in shaping Brexit-related legislation.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Parliamentary debate

specifics, exact academic contributions cited in the court's acknowledgment, public opinion influence.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific recognition of the research's influence on public debate through media and Parliamentary Committee references was mentioned in the REF but missing in the AI.

---

"

"67. Study Title : Bristol's materials research is keeping the UK's fleet of nuclear power stations safe and operating.

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific safety case contributions, such as the detailed role UoB played in the Hunterston B Reactor 3 extension. Detailed partnerships with EDF and industry-specific contributions, like the impact on the Boiler Lifetime Inspection Program.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the multi-million-pound contracts and the UKRI grants are less detailed in the AI version. The AI also underemphasizes certain stakeholders, such as specific professional bodies (e.g., IAEA) that were mentioned in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Examples of reactor-specific safety cases, such as the Hunterston B Reactor extension; specific monetary values associated with energy savings; EDF's direct quotes regarding safety case validation.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific EDF safety cases, boiler lifetime inspection programs, and detailed references to individual reactors such as Hunterston B.

---

"

"68. Study Title : Radical advance in treating age-related macular degeneration leading to global impact in prevention of blindness

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission places more emphasis on the legal and regulatory impacts, such as the Court of Appeal's decision supporting CCGs, which is not fully captured in the AI-generated version. Additionally, specific references to the World Health Organization's Essential Medicines List and the global regulatory landscape are absent from the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details of the UK Court of Appeal's decision in 2020 and legal challenges against NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups, which were pivotal in cementing the research's policy impact, were missing in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed instances of specific NHS CCGs adopting policies based on the IVAN trial data and legal challenges involved in bevacizumab's licensing are thoroughly documented in the REF but not detailed in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Notably, the REF case includes precise details about regional adoption by the NHS CCGs and specific citations from NICE's economic analysis, which are underrepresented in the AI version. Additionally, court cases influencing pharmaceutical policy, which further establish the REF impact, are not reflected.

---

"

"69. Study Title : Rolling programme of research, centred on the National Joint Registry, to improve the outcomes of hip and knee replacements worldwide

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific statistics like the exact number of avoided revisions (e.g., 8,000 excess revisions prevented), detailed NHS savings (e.g., GBP252 million to GBP281 million), and citations from organizations like MHRA, NICE, FDA, and European regulatory bodies were extensively covered in the REF version but not mentioned in the AI-generated one.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed statistics

on the decline of metal-on-metal implants (e.g., UK, Australia), specific citations of bodies such as the FDA and NICE.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific regulatory citations (FDA 2013), direct impact on UDI (Unique Device Identifiers) recommendations, and impact details on revision surgeries are provided in the REF but less emphasized in the AI-generated version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed MHRA and NICE guidelines, US FDA recommendations on metal implants, UoB influence on specific implant types and revision rates.

---

"

"70. Study Title : Reducing breast and ovarian cancer occurrences in women at high risk

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Policy adoption details: The REF report specifies endorsements from major organizations like the US National Comprehensive Cancer Network and NICE for BOADICEA, contributing to the tool's credibility. The ChatGPT version lacks these precise policy references.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes specific endorsements by international bodies, such as NICE, NHS Breast Screening Program, and the National Comprehensive Cancer Network, which are not highlighted in the AI-generated impacts. Additionally, the REF details real-world usage metrics, including the number of professionals and countries using BOADICEA, which is missing from the AI content.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mortality reduction estimates (e.g., "helps avoid around 120 deaths from ovarian cancer and 60 deaths from breast cancer annually"), detailed regional uptake statistics, and endorsements by organizations like NICE, NCCN, and NHS were omitted.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details such as the CE marking approval by the UK regulator, endorsement by U.S. cancer organizations, and adoption in NHS Breast Screening guidelines were noted in the REF submission but omitted in ChatGPT's analysis.

---

"

"71. Study Title : The Haydn Scale: Changing policy and practice for improving pupil behaviour in schools

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Specific references to Ofsted's 2019 policy on behavior management. 2) Direct quotes from policymakers and academic testimonials. 3) Detailed citations from Bennett's Review emphasizing Haydn's research in policy documentation.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Notably, the AI version missed specific mentions of the Bennett Review, Ofsted's policy shifts due to Haydn's work, and specific university-led teacher training initiatives. These were crucial components in showcasing the depth of policy influence in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the Bennett Review, references to exact publications cited by policymakers, and detailed impacts on teacher education conferences were less prominent in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive quoting of Haydn's work in Bennett Review, specific citations by Ofsted, and policy changes between 2012 and 2019 based on Haydn's contributions.

---

"

"72. Study Title : ""Definitive demonstration of the adverse cardiovascular effects of air pollution leads to policy change at the local, national, and international level""

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific media outlets (BBC, Channel 4) and events (e.g., BHF's 2020 Westminster event) are listed in the REF but are not specified in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Key media engagements (e.g., BBC, Channel 4 documentaries), direct influence on the British Heart Foundation (BHF) strategy, specific parliamentary engagements, and reference to government publications citing the research.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific UoE engagements with BHF, mentions of direct media appearances, and involvement in UK governmental policies on air quality were detailed in the REF submission but were generalized in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder engagement details, such as interviews with major news outlets and direct quotes from policymakers, were only included in the REF submission.

---

"

"73. Study Title : Navigating Inclusion in International Peace Processes

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed reference to UNSCR 2242, Articles 1 and 7, UNSCR 1325 implementation reviews, specific OECD frameworks like the DAC's Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus, and PSRP's role in the 2018 UNSG Report and UNSCR 2493.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to articles in UNSCR 2242 and 2493, direct quotes from senior UN advisors emphasizing the PSRP's critical role in policy shifts.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to UNSCR 2242 and 2493, contributions to the OECD Development Assistance Committee's 'Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus,' and specific quotes from UN and OECD advisors about the research's importance.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific clauses of UNSCR articles directly impacted by PSRP's research, detailed contributions to OECD DAC recommendations, and the explicit references to the UN Secretary General's policy recommendations.

---

"

"74. Study Title : Documenting and Protecting Survivors of Torture and Ill-Treatment Living in Poor Communities

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Detailed organization-level impacts, including IMLU's strategic adaptations in Kenya. - Development and usage statistics of the mobile documentation app, which facilitated community-driven reporting of torture cases.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific project locations (e.g., Kenya, Morocco) and data, such as the app usage metrics (203 panic alerts and 234 incident notifications). Additionally, specific collaborations with organizations like Dignity and workshops in Geneva with NGOs are detailed in REF but are not fully replicated in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quantitative data, such as IMLU app notifications and panic alerts, which demonstrate the practical impact of the research on monitoring and documentation practices. Additionally, mentions of specific NGOs and the involvement in the UN Committee Against Torture are detailed in REF but less explicit in ChatGPT.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific names of organizations such as IMLU and the exact statistics of alerts and incident notifications were omitted. Additionally, exact references to the UN and specific publications (e.g., Torture journal) were not specified in the AI version.

---

"

"75. Study Title : Transforming genomic selection in commercial breeding programmes for pigs, dairy goats, and poultry

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Economic estimates, like profitability boosts for Genus clients; specific productivity traits in pigs (female reproductive traits) and poultry (fertility).

Rater 2 Rating = Rating: 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative metrics related to productivity increases (e.g., specific yearly growth rates in piglet births and milk yields), detailed financial impacts for Genus and Yorkshire Dairy Goats, and economic calculations for the global pig and poultry industries, which quantify profit potentials and sustainable production savings more precisely.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific financial gains for producers (e.g., GBP300,000,000 annually for Genus customers), precision in quantitative metrics of genetic gain improvement, and cumulative effect across years (e.g., doubling accuracy in reproductive traits, annual increases in piglet production)

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed quantification of productivity increases (e.g., 40% rate for pigs, specific reproductive traits), specific organizational impacts (e.g., Genus, Aviagen), and geographic expansion (New Zealand).

---

"

"76. Study Title : Employing polymer physics to improve gluten-free bread structure

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of Lucinda Bruce-Gardyne's role and the ""Entrepreneur in Residence"" mentorship impact on early-career researchers, as described in the REF submission, was missing in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder engagement, such as partnerships with Genius and entrepreneurial mentoring programs, were clearly articulated in the REF submission but not in the AI version. The entrepreneurial culture fostered through collaboration and mentoring was another area distinctly emphasized in the REF that was overlooked in the AI-generated content.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Economic turnover specifics (GBP34,000,000) and certain process details impacting consumer consistency.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific engagement with UoE's Dr. Keith Bromley and Genius Food's entrepreneurial mentorship roles.

---

"

"77. Study Title : Peripheral Impressionisms: challenging perceptions of Impressionism

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific auction statistics for Daubigny's works, sponsorship details like the Terra Foundation's contributions, and precise visitor attendance figures at international venues were exclusive to the REF version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific auction dates and price details, visitor numbers for different exhibitions, and certain direct quotes from press reviews, e.g., "sparkling exhibition" by The Financial Times.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific auction details such as Daubigny's elevated sales prices, individual visitor statistics per exhibition location, and curatorial symposia led by Fowle.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific auction price examples and individual institutional feedback, such as comments from London Art Dealers and record attendance at distinct museums, were less detailed in the AI content.

---

"

"78. Study Title : Raising the profile of Scottish Literature through writing and consultancy

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics of Riach's influence in the redesign of banknotes by The Royal Bank of Scotland, notably his selection of historic quotations and advisory work with design teams, which is crucial to the public engagement objective.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission emphasized the use of quotes in different languages to reflect Scotland's cultural diversity, which was not fully captured in the AI-generated version. Additionally, the RBS project's historical context and its importance to future Scottish generations were explicitly tied to Professor Riach's long-term research goals in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Visitor feedback on Landmarks exhibition engagement; specific quotes used in banknotes and their cultural symbolism.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific involvement of literary advisors in designing cultural artifacts (like banknotes) and the exact public feedback mechanisms facilitated through national newspapers.

---

"

"79. Study Title : Secukinumab becomes the first interleukin-17A inhibitor approved for psoriatic arthritis

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific clinical outcomes (e.g., ACR20 improvements) and trial phases were elaborated in the REF submission, enhancing clarity on therapeutic efficacy and safety milestones.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details on McInnes' steering role in guideline updates by EULAR and GRAPPA; nuanced aspects of clinical impact within specific PsA patient demographics (e.g., severe skin involvement).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific approval dates for EMA and FDA, and extensive stakeholder engagement details.

Rater 4 Rating = 5

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed citation of specific regulatory approvals (e.g., EMA, FDA), specific clinical study identifiers (e.g., FUTURE 1, 2, 5), and more granular patient outcome data on PsA's quality of life improvements.

---

"

"80. Study Title : Establishing the Facts, Developing Professionalisation and Enabling Transparent 'Pilgrim-centred' Communication in the UK Hajj Sector

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version elaborates on media coverage of Hajj-related incidents (e.g., the 2015 stampede) and specific consultative events held at the House of Lords, adding details about stakeholder quotes that enhanced legitimacy. Specific statistics on McLoughlin's media mentions across continents were omitted in the AI summary.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics of media engagement in countries like Germany and Turkey, in-depth references to the 2015 Hajj stampede coverage, and the APPG collaborations in regulatory mapping.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific involvement of the APPG Vice Chairs in the consultations and the role of the UK government's neoliberal stance in the Hajj sector's self-regulation efforts.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific citations in media during the 2015 Hajj stampede, details on McLoughlin's involvement with major British news outlets, and the unique citation of his work during COVID-19 by international broadcasters such as Deutsche Welle.

---

"

"81. Study Title : A Bridge for Spies: Overcoming the Practitioner-Academic Gap in Intelligence and Security

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific involvement of agencies such as NATO and NCA, mentions of Five Eyes, the Intelligence Assessment Academy's direct ties to Dover's recommendations, and the cultural shift in the intelligence community toward external academic engagement were emphasized in REF but not in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific endorsements from high-level stakeholders, including explicit references to the Cabinet Office

and individual agencies in the Five Eyes group, which are not explicitly stated in the AI version. Also, unique contribution to the Five Eyes Group's professional standards for analysts.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The ChatGPT version does not mention the specific role of the Cabinet Office in establishing the Intelligence Assessment Academy or Dover's advisory role in recruitment for the academy's leadership, which are noted in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed protocols on UK Intelligence Academy training; impacts on specific organizations such as NATO and Five Eyes, and the use of protocols for analyst engagement.

"

"82. Study Title : Influencing Labour Standards and Stakeholder Action Through International, European and National Law and Policy

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission discusses specific legislative changes in Greece (Law 4472/2017) and in South Africa regarding the gender pay gap, which are not specifically detailed in the ChatGPT-generated version. Additionally, the role of the ETUC in Greece and the EU's responses to austerity are highlighted only in the REF version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed contributions to specific institutions (e.g., European Parliament and ILO's Global Deal), evidence of legal consultation outcomes, and specific legislative references like Greece's Law 4472/2017 were not explicitly covered in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impact on Greek labor law adjustments through collective dismissal reforms and the endorsement by the Council of Europe, as noted in the REF.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to OECD and UN entities, details on regional legislative outcomes like European Court decisions, and citation of Greek-specific labor law reforms.

"

"83. Study Title : Creating Value and Transforming Lives through Arts and Creative Media Practice

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Examples include: explicit reference to ""UNESCO World Heritage status application for Gdansk Shipyard"" and specific organizational collaborations such as "Clyde Docks Preservation Initiative" in Glasgow (REF 2021).

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to the specific policy outcomes (such as the UNESCO application) and the exact timeline of engagement were more explicit in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed local impact of refusal on Govan Graving Docks housing development, specific conference mentions like UN-Habitat and events influencing Glasgow City Council decisions.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit details on the specific sites of Gdansk and Govan shipyards and the policy influence around UNESCO designation.

"

"84. Study Title : A Transformation in Creep Condition Monitoring for High Temperature, High Pressure Components

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of ESKOM and SASOL as industrial applications and ASME code certification's importance in expanding technology adoption in high-stakes industries such as nuclear power. Recognition of local impact in South Africa, including contributions to skill development and industry partnerships (e.g., collaborations with NMU, South African Academy, and European Union initiatives).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed ASME code

approval process, specific contributions to fracture toughness testing, and nuances around Eskom's direct application outcomes.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts of WeldCore on ESKOM's unplanned generation losses and load-shedding impacts on South Africa, which was highlighted as a societal benefit in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaboration details between Plymouth and NMU, and South African industrial recognition.

---

"

"85. Study Title : The creation (and re-creation) of contemporary female heroines at the center of new plays for the theatre.

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of individual awards like the Herald Angel and Berwin Lee playwriting award, and detailed audience demographics in different countries (e.g., specific numbers from Istanbul's DOT Theatre and Diana Theatre, Athens).

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: International debates around women's roles in theater and mentorship of young Turkish, Kurdish, and Iranian playwrights.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific attendance numbers for productions, details on theatre capacity (e.g., Royal Court Theatre's 98% capacity record), and awards won by the plays were detailed in the REF but not covered in ChatGPT.

Rater 4 Rating = [4 - Very Good]

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Geographic spread and audience metrics, including specific attendance figures and production details in countries such as Turkey and Sweden. Mentions of specific awards won and particular festivals where the works were presented, like the Avignon Festival and Edinburgh International Festival.

---

"

"86. Study Title : Changes to cervical screening policies following the rollout of human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific implementation years, such as the change in screening age in 2016, and direct quotes from the Scottish HPV Reference Laboratory were missing in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI-generated report lacks direct references to individual stakeholders like the Advisory Committee on Cervical Screening (ACCS) and the detailed 2018 NHS decision-making process to switch to HPV testing over cytology.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions, such as the direct role of Strathclyde researchers in policy shifts, were not emphasized in the AI version, which provided a broader overview without specifying individual contributions.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific changes to the Scottish Cervical Screening Programme's age range and detailed policy influence on both the UK NSC and JCVI committees.

---

"

"87. Study Title : Combating Crop Losses and Improving Global Food Supplies through Mathematical Modelling of "Gene Silencing"

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included specific regional details, such as Ukraine's role as a major agricultural producer and the unique soil composition of Prydniprovs'ky, which supports specific crop growth. Additionally, it detailed the MOU with Ukraine and the widespread adoption rate among local farmers, emphasizing deeper regional impact.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Stakeholder quotes (e.g., Ukrainian agronomists), specific crop yield percentages (e.g., exact yield improvements for individual crops), and quantitative economic metrics related to the regional agribusiness

impact.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Mention of regional economic benefits, stakeholder testimonials, and specific policy implications

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific yield increase percentages for each crop, regional adoption rates in Ukraine, and the economic impact on local agribusiness.

---

"

"88. Study Title : Emerging Media, Learning, and Organisational Practice - Driving Change in Tourism and Education in Northern Ireland

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific names of stakeholders (e.g., Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council, Mourne Heritage Trust), and detailed examples of educational impacts at primary schools (e.g., Millstrand Integrated Primary School).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific roles of Jackson's recommendations in defining the user journey for heritage sites, direct mentions of managerial feedback from CCGBC, and nuanced aspects of technological innovation specific to Northern Ireland's tourism.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed impacts on Northern Ireland's cultural heritage policy development; specific partnerships with local educational institutions, as outlined for impact dimensions I3 and I4.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Mention of Jackson's detailed work with specific councils (e.g., CCGBC) in creating the 'virtual journey' concept; integration of analytical data for app development; impact on specific cultural strategies within the council's tourism provision.

---

"

"89. Study Title : Global adoption of the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) into clinical practice

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific trials and quantitative data: The REF mentions distinct clinical trials, such as the Sanofi-funded Phase III trials for dupilumab and specific licensing details, which are not detailed in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: NICE inclusion in Technology Appraisals for specific dermatological conditions, detailed revenue impact from licensing, and role in drug approval (e.g., dupilumab approval).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific guidelines like NICE, revenue figures from DLQI's licensing, and named clinical trials (e.g., Sanofi's Phase III trials) are missing in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific pharmaceutical trials like SOLO 1, 2, CHRONOS, and CAFÉ; specific revenue figures; detailed expansion on NICE's recommendation and guideline inclusions.

---

"

"90. Study Title : Improving the healthcare experiences of children and young people

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission highlighted specific training standards created for the Restraint Reduction Network (RRN) as well as the evaluation metrics used in clinical settings, such as feedback directly from clinicians and patients. Additionally, detailed mechanisms such as PPI (Patient and Public Involvement) engagement and international dissemination strategies were more thoroughly discussed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborative roles (e.g., Professor Bray's guideline group participation), NHS-specific standards adherence, and feedback from clinicians on restraint reduction.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of RRN training standards, the role in the development of national guidelines, and the NHS endorsement.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder engagement activities, such as workshops and policy-focused discussions, appear more detailed in the REF submission compared to the AI-generated content, which lacks explicit mention of these engagement actions.

---

"

"91. Study Title : The value of the Carers' Alert Thermometer (CAT) in identifying family carers' needs and supporting them in their caring role

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed feedback from carers on the positive impact of CAT's use, NIHR and Gold Standards Framework (GSF) endorsements, and international application (e.g., Western Australia). These endorsements and testimonials provide concrete evidence of CAT's positive reception and adoption in multiple healthcare contexts.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific stakeholder feedback loops, including family feedback from MND support settings. 2. Detailed policy advocacy components for NICE and DoH use cases.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: ChatGPT lacks details on specific international applications, such as the implementation in Australia and Canada, and the tool's mention in specific training frameworks like the National Gold Standards Framework.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed quotes and feedback from carers and healthcare staff, specific institutions adopting CAT, and localized examples like MND Scotland and MNDWA applications.

---

"

"92. Study Title : God-complexity and the Multiple God-Aspects Framework

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit engagement with the US Mormon population and clinical applications with the Centre for Research and Innovation in Christian Mental Health Care. Detailed references to stakeholder feedback from conferences.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Public blog engagement, detailed specific conference presentations (SSSR, SPSP, IAPR), engagement with clinical applications, particularly within the Centre for Research and Innovation in Christian Mental Health Care.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit mention of feedback from stakeholders at conferences (e.g., IAPR 2017, SSSR 2017) and engagement with religious communities to discuss clinical applications were in REF but absent in AI-generated content.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of well-being impacts associated with God-complexity, precise conference feedback, and public outreach data like the Science and Religion blog metrics.

---

"

"93. Study Title : Abertay Game Lab: play, performance, and public engagement with games

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific attendance numbers, demographic details of exhibition visitors, detailed workshop participation statistics, and individual beneficiary quotes from industry stakeholders like Gunfish Games and We Throw Switches.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific attendee demographics for V&A events, including first-time visitor rates and detailed breakdowns of age and gender statistics; unique testimonies from We Throw Switches and Pocket Sized Hands.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed demographic data from the V&A exhibition, influence on first-time visitors, specifics on BAME engagement percentages, and precise audience segmentation were discussed in the REF submission but not in ChatGPT's version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific workshop locations and detailed audience demographics at V&A exhibitions (e.g., age and ethnic diversity).

---

"  
"94. Study Title : Improving Care for Patients with Chronic and Distressing Tinnitus through Mindfulness Based Interventions

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Specific feedback from the British Tinnitus Association (BTA) confirming MBCT's adoption across 49 services; 2) Quantitative data on patients treated (e.g., over 5,000 patients and specific numbers from clinics like RNENTDH).

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed accounts of the British Tinnitus Association's public awareness initiatives and specific patient satisfaction scores (e.g., 4.6/5 at certain clinics).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct testimonies from clinical staff and specific numerical data on patient improvements, such as the 865 patients reached annually by RNENTDH since implementation.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Inclusion of feedback from specific hospitals and quantifiable data on changes in patient outcomes, such as satisfaction ratings and re-referral rates. Detailed impact statements from the British Tinnitus Association (BTA) and specific health economics analysis results supporting MBCT-t as cost-effective.

---

"  
"95. Study Title : Developing and Embedding Effective Careers Guidance for Young People in England

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: High-level policy endorsements, especially from specific government entities in Wales and Hong Kong; detailed adoption specifics of the Gatsby Benchmarks across different regions.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original REF submission highlights regional adaptations and specific endorsements of the benchmarks, such as the House of Lords debate and primary context adaptations (e.g., Spain's application in 68 schools). Additionally, detailed feedback from educators on pilot programs in the North East was less emphasized in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific influence on the House of Lords debate and Baroness Bottomley's endorsement, statutory requirement for a Careers Leader by 2018, and exact training statistics for Career Leaders.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to regional adaptations, such as pilot implementations in Spain and Norway, were present in the REF submission but missed in the AI summary.

---

"  
"96. Study Title : Design meets disability: changing the relationship between disability and design in business, culture, practice, and education

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder quotes from key industry figures like the Principal Design Strategist at Microsoft and their detailed impact on board-level advocacy in companies like Unilever and Prada.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific exhibitions (e.g., V&A Dundee, Cooper Hewitt Smithsonian) that provided direct public engagement. 2. Key quotes from figures in the industry and policy sectors, e.g., from McCauley Wanner and The Valuable 500's leadership. 3. Specific mention of corporate transformations at

Microsoft and The Valuable 500, demonstrating institutional commitment.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quotes and personal reflections from Alleles' founder and The Valuable 500 leadership on how they directly engaged with the research were not captured in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed narratives on exhibitions and specific visitor impact at V&A Dundee, mentions of individual experiences in exhibitions like Hands of X and media coverage impact (e.g., Domus and Icon).

"

"97. Study Title : Digital Archiving for Curation and Dissemination

Rater 1 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF included detailed recognition by international organizations (e.g., UNESCO) and explicit partnerships, which validate the archival project's impact on international curatorial practices and scholarly discourse (e.g., quotes from curators and press).

Rater 2 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit policy impacts on regional archiving standards

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct quotes from experts (e.g., the Kantor scholar's statement on archival footage importance) and detailed audience statistics (e.g., demographics and engagement metrics).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit stakeholder endorsements, exhibition statistics across locations, and detailed quotes from subject matter experts on impact significance.

"

"98. Study Title : Prevention and management of head injuries in cricket and rugby union

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific funding sources and amounts for studies, injury surveillance definition changes, and details on feedback loops from stakeholders in rugby.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details, such as the financial support amounts for different initiatives (e.g., grants from WRU, ECB) and involvement of organizations like the British Standards Institute (BSI), were omitted in the ChatGPT version. Additionally, granular technical details on testing protocols for helmet impact zones were not reflected.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific contributions to the British Standards Institute (BS7928:2013) for cricket helmets; detailed role of ICC in helmet safety policy updates; specifics on the WRU-funded Concussion Education Programme attendance and referee education.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Injury surveillance protocols and medical attention definitions tailored to rugby injuries were not highlighted in the AI version. The AI content also overlooked the international stakeholder involvement in policy formulation, specifically in updating rugby concussion protocols.

"

"99. Study Title : The Kindertransport 1938/1939 to the UK: History Informing the Future

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides specific instances of direct feedback from exhibition attendees and policymakers, including quotes from stakeholders like the Imperial War Museum event and the Director of Public Health Wales, which directly cite the relevance of the research findings for contemporary refugee policy. These details are less explicit in the AI-generated content.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific locations and details of exhibitions (Berlin, Rotenburg, and London) and explicit quotes from stakeholders and attendees (e.g., direct public feedback from exhibition visitors and specific policy debates at Welsh Government).

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific public talks (e.g., Imperial War Museum event) and exhibitions (e.g., Berlin, Rotenburg) contributing to heightened public engagement.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to specific stakeholder engagements, such as the Berlin exhibition's role in reaching diverse audiences, were missing in the AI version. Additionally, the nuanced historical context and details about adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) in influencing modern refugee policies are less emphasized in the AI analysis.

---

"

"100. Study Title : An evidence-based approach reduces the local costs of biodiversity conservation in low- and middle-income countries

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific reference to the Ambatovy mine's adaptation of social impact safeguards in response to Bangor research, collaboration with the French Development Agency in Africa, and certain qualitative quotes from stakeholders (e.g., quotes from the Malagasy Environment Minister on reforms influenced by Bangor's research).

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mention of Uganda and Myanmar's national offset strategies, and the involvement of international financial institutions like the European Investment Bank in Madagascar.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnerships, like with the Ugandan government and other African countries, and direct references to named policies and principles (e.g., ""No Net Loss"" for biodiversity and people).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

AAR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific projects (e.g., Ambatovy mine) and stakeholder testimonials (e.g., statements from the Minister of Environment in Madagascar) which underscore the human impact were more prominent in REF.

These add depth to policy influence which ChatGPT missed in specific examples.

---

"